DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 098 JC 910 397

AUTHOR Grunder, Patricia; And Others
TITLE Developing an Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Program: A Collection of Resources for Florida Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.; Florida Univ., Gainesville. Interinstitutional Research Council.
PUB DATE Jun 91
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; *College Planning; *Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; Institutional Research; Literature Reviews; Mission Statements; *Organizational Effectiveness; Program Development; Self Evaluation (Groups); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

Recent accreditation criteria established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) require all Florida community colleges to develop, implement, and maintain a formalized and ongoing planning, budgeting, and evaluation process which continuously examines and evaluates institutional performance within the confines of the institutional mission. Designed to assist colleges in developing an assessment and effectiveness plan, this report provides a detailed review of the SACS Criteria for Accreditation, and summarizes the literature currently available on institutional effectiveness. An introductory section analyzes SACS accreditation criteria as they relate to institution mission, planning and evaluation, and institutional research. The report then examines the role of institutional research in measuring institutional effectiveness. The next section cites state and federal reports and databases relevant to institutional effectiveness efforts. A listing of the key articles and reports specific to community college effectiveness programs concludes the report. Appendix A presents the specific sections of the SACS Accreditation Criteria, while Appendix B provides an annotated bibliography of 15 ERIC documents on institutional effectiveness, as well as a list of 62 other suggested readings. (PAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335098

DEVELOPING AN INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

A COLLECTION OF RESOURCES FOR FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Wattenbarger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Patricia Grunder
R. Bruce Judd
Oel Wingo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A publication of the Institute of Higher Education and the Interinstitutional Research Council of the University of Florida, Gainesville, Fl.

JC 910 397

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Developing an Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Program: A Collection of Resources for Florida Community Colleges

by

Patricia Grunder
Santa Fe Community College

Bruce Judd
Edison Community College

Oel Wingo
Central Florida Community College

Interinstitutional Research Council
University of Florida

June, 1991

The problem that Community College Presidents considered to be the most pervasive, as reported in the June, 1990 meeting that focused upon IRC activities, was Institutional Effectiveness. This monograph is the first attempt by IRC member colleges to provide assistance in this area. Your comments and suggestions for follow through will be welcomed.

James L. Wattenbarger

Developing an Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Program:
A Collection of Resources for Florida Community Colleges

Introduction

In response to inquiries from Interinstitutional Research Council (IRC) members, the IRC developed this document summarizing the literature which is currently available on Institutional Effectiveness. Since the vast majority of the community colleges in Florida have either recently completed or are preparing for an upcoming accreditation visit, all Florida community colleges will be required to develop an ongoing program which monitors each college's overall effectiveness within the guidelines established by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Section III Criteria for Accreditation.

The newness of the Institutional Effectiveness Criteria places an additional burden on the individuals at each college who are directly involved in guiding the reaccreditation process, because the Criteria in Section III appear on the surface to be, at best, vague and confusing. This document is by no means an attempt to do a complete review of all of the literature on Institutional Effectiveness; on the contrary, it is meant to be a guide which highlights that subset of Institutional Effectiveness literature that has been found to be useful to the authors of this guide or to the Institutional Researchers who represent other IRC member colleges.

SACS Reaccreditation Criteria on Institutional Effectiveness

In 1987 SACS established a new component of the accreditation process with the introduction and acceptance of Section III of the Criteria for Accreditation. Section III focuses exclusively on the criteria used for evaluating the effectiveness of an institution in the delivery of its Institutional Mission. Since its inception, the criteria set forth in Section III have added a new voice in the chorus which has been discordantly crying for accountability within the educational arena. The intent of Section III was ostensibly

> ...the expansion of the process [of accreditation] to emphasize the results of education and to focus on the extent to which the institution uses assessment information to re-evaluate goals, to make essential improvements, and to plan for the future. (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1987, pg.iii)

The net effect of the criteria in Section III was to ensure that all institutions accredited by SACS will develop, implement and maintain a formalized, on-going planning, budgeting and evaluation process which continuously examines and evaluates institutional performance within the confines of the self-defined Institutional Mission.

SACS outlined within the body of Section III a series of criteria ("MUST" and "SHOULD" statements) which pertain directly to minimum standards which must be in place at each institution being accredited. These criteria focus specifically on (1) Planning and Evaluation, and (2) Institutional Research. It is through the criteria established in Section III that the accreditation process for SACS member institutions will examine and review the issue of "quality" at institutions participating in the reaccreditation process.

> The quality of education provided by member institutions is the primary consideration in the decision to confer or reaffirm accreditation. The evaluation of educational quality is a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgement . . . It has usually been assumed that, if an institution has certain resources and uses certain processes, effective education will occur. A comprehensive approach to accreditation, however, takes into account not only the resources and processes of education (such as faculty and student qualifications, physical plant, fiscal resources and other elements addressed in the Criteria) but also the evaluation of the results of education and plans for the improvement of the institution's programs.
>
> The level of institutional quality depends not only on an institution's educational processes and resources but also on the institution's successful use of those processes and resources to achieve established goals. Institutions have an obligation to all constituents to evaluate effectiveness and to use the results in a broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation process. (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1991, pg. 14)

As stated earlier, the criteria set forth within the body of Section III specifically address planning, evaluation, and institutional research. The specific criteria related to Institutional Effectiveness are listed in Appendix A. The criteria listed in Appendix A focus on the relationship between Institutional Mission and planning, budgeting, and evaluation, and are drawn

from all sections of the Criteria. Alignment of these components is essential in order to both achieve an institution's goals and also to meet the SACS criteria for accreditation.

Planning and Evaluation. The Criteria for Accreditation, states that each institution "...must define its expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained" (pg. 14, 1991). Beyond this "must" statement the SACS criteria set only minimal requirements on the planning process, with the understanding that each institution is unique and should develop its own planning process that meets the criteria, but still reflects the unique organization and mission of the institution. The Criteria for Accreditation outlines the following requirements for an acceptable planning process.

> Although no specific format for this planning and evaluation process is prescribed, an effective process should include:
>
> 1. broad-based involvement of faculty and administration.
> 2. the establishment of a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education
> 3. the formulation of educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose
> 4. the development of procedures for evaluating the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved, and
> 5. the use of the results of these evaluations to improve institutional effectiveness. (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1991, pg. 14-15)

Beyond this loose set of guidelines, a second "should" statement suggests "...institutions should ascertain periodically the change in the academic achievement of their students" (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1991, pg. 14-15).

Institutional Research. The remainder of Section III briefly establishes suggested parameters under which data should be gathered for the evaluation process. The vehicle for this process is the institutional research function of the institution. The criteria state "All institutions, however, must engage in continuous study, analysis, and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs" (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1991, pg. 15). The criteria also

specifically state that evaluations of all components of the institution's effectiveness should include the evaluation of institutional research!

The Role of Institutional Research in Measuring Institutional Effectiveness

A "should" statement in Section III of the Criteria states "Institutional research should be allocated adequate resources, and those responsible for it should be given access to all relevant information" (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1991, pg. 15). By necessity these resources must be the hardware, software, and personnel required to access, manipulate and distribute the data needed for planning, budgeting, and evaluation of institutional effectiveness at all levels.

The Office or Department of Institutional Research is, usually by default, the terminus for all surveys, reports, and data requests forwarded from all other offices college-wide. This office also serves the dual roll of having to assemble and compile data for the myriad state and federally-mandated reports as well as providing an annual series of Institutional Research reports or a factbook. Although these data are scattered and frequently in a form or format which cannot serve any function other than what it was originally designed to do (i.e. printouts designed to "fill in the blanks" in a specific state report). Offices of institutional research must be sufficiently sophisticated to access data directly either through a physical connection to a network and access to the institutional central data source, or indirectly by having the capability to assemble raw data from mainframe application program output and manipulate it within a PC database or spreadsheet environment. Access to data quickly becomes a mission-critical function of any office of institutional research in order to adequately meet the criteria outlined in Section III.

Unfortunately, the report writing function of an office of institutional research is quickly becoming a secondary task relative to the more comprehensive role as a central source for Institutional Effectiveness data. Despite the fact that simple clerical skills have historically been all that was required for institutional research personnel, under the new SACS criteria, someone in this office must have above average computer and communication skills in order to respond to the current definition of institutional research as required by the SACS criteria in Section III.

State/Federal Reports and Institutional Effectiveness

Fortunately, there appear to be potential parallels between the myriad of state and federal reports, and the SACS Criteria for Institutional Effectiveness. Many state and federal reports require data sets which also include data which can potentially be utilized for on-going evaluation of institutional effectiveness. In Florida's community colleges, the single most comprehensive source for institutional effectiveness data on students, staff, graduates, and costs, are the databases which are regularly sent electronically to the Division of Community Colleges (i.e. SDB series, CARS, and APR).

These databases are analyzed by the DCCMIS and reports are returned to the individual colleges for confirmation. Unfortunately, many institutions lack the capability to confirm these reports easily or utilize the state-mandated databases as a potential resource. Despite the fact that these databases are only a "snapshot in time" of the total data contained within local student records datasets, this is the data that is being used by the Executive and Legislative branches of government to make funding and construction decisions. The accuracy and the content of these datasets should be of paramount importance to every institution supplying them to the DCC.

For a college with a maximum Fall Enrollment of 9000+ credit students, the total final Fall database (SBE-2E) is smaller than 10MB for all seven record types combined, when downloaded to a PC. The largest single record type is only approximately 6MB. Files of this size are readily manipulated using a 80386 based PC with a relational database, that is connected to the institution's central data source. Simple queries on a PC relational database take only a few seconds to complete and more complex queries will take a few minutes at most. The other datasets forwarded to the DCC are much smaller, typically less than 1-2MB. These databases alone, when made readily accessible to institutional researchers, are an invaluable resource that most institutions squander by not utilizing them to their fullest potential.

In addition to the databases listed above, other valuable state reported data, which are potentially useful for evaluating institutional effectiveness, are not being fully utilized for planning and evaluation in most institutions at this time. The AA-1, EE-1 series, IPEDS, EL-1, FA series, FETPIP, PRA series, and PRV series reports all contain valuable data which in a PC environment can be used by institutional researchers as the basis for internal

institutional effectiveness measures as they are currently being reported.

The role of institutional research has been greatly expanded in relation to institutional planning and evaluation under the Section III criteria. This broader participation is reflected within the Criteria in the "should" statement that points out the need for adequate resources for institutional research. The elevation of an institution's Institutional Research function to a new level of importance in the planning and evaluation components of the Institutional Effectiveness criteria can have real meaning only if the interaction and capabilities of Institutional Research staff keep up with the demands for data.

Additional Sources of Information on Institutional Effectiveness Programs for Community Colleges

Since 1986 there has been an explosion of reports, summaries and articles directly addressing Institutional Effectiveness. Certain components of this "reading list" are particularly important to all institutions about to go through the reaccreditation process. The central purpose of this document is to provide a variety of resources and ideas which will make the process of developing the capability to meet the SACS Institutional Effectiveness criteria less of an overwhelming task. With this in mind a list of selected references is included in Appendix B of this document. It is important to note that the enclosed bibliography is by no means a complete review of the subject. The emphasis taken in preparing this bibliography is to provide documents which are viewed as being useful to the practitioner who has recently encountered the concept of Institutional Effectiveness.

There are several publications which stand out as being essential to institutions preparing for reaccreditation. These documents are available directly from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Decatur, GA, 30033-4097.

1. Criteria for Accreditation - 1991 Edition
2. Resource Manual on Institutional Effectiveness, 1987
3. Manual For Accreditation, 1988

Of all the other documents reviewed, one in particular provides the best general overview. Published by the League of Innovation in the Community College, Laguna Hills, CA, Assessing Institutional Effectiveness in Community Colleges edited by Don Doucette and Billie Hughes, is a key resource on this topic. It focuses on the fundamental components of the general mission of all community colleges and offers a

guide to assessing the Transfer Mission, Career Preparation Mission, Basic Skills Mission, Continuing Education Mission, and the Access Mission. In addition to providing a guide it also suggests some potential data sources for each component of each mission addressed within the body of the document. Other documents worthy of special note in the selected references in Appendix B include:

1. Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. (1988) from the AACJC;

2. Institutional Effectiveness Practices in Community Colleges in the Southern Region, (1989), George Baker and Charles Roberts, Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice. 13 (1), 45-61.

3. The Challenge of Self-Renewal in the Innovative College. (1990, Spr-Sum), Douglas Johnstone, Innovative Higher Education, 14 (2), 107-122.

4. Value Added: Measuring the Community College's Effectiveness. (1989, Apr-May), George B. Vaughan and Robert G. Templin. Community, Technical and Junior College Journal, 59 (5), 38-45.

5. Assessment! Action! Accreditation! (1991, April/May) Howard L. Simmons, Community, Technical and Junior College Journal, 61 (5), 26-30.

6. Creating a Culture for Institutional Effectiveness, (1991, April/May), Richard L. Alfred and Paul Kreider, Community, Technical and Junior College Journal, 61 (5), 34-39.

Of special interest to Florida Community Colleges would be the experiences and programs currently in place at other Florida community colleges. Several Colleges have published or made available through ERIC document service reviews of their efforts in the arena of Institutional Effectiveness.

1. Institutional Assessment Manual for the Review of Instructional Programs, Administrative Operations and Instructional Support Services. Florida Community College at Jacksonville, Nov. 1989 [ED 318501]

2. The FACET Report. Toward 2001: An Odyssey of Excellence. St. Petersburg Junior College, April 1990, [ED 319418]

3. Increasing Institutional Effectiveness through Outcomes Assessment. Donna Wilkinson and Peggy Green [Broward Community College], A paper presented at the Annual Convention of the AACJC, March 29-April 1, 1989. [ED 307914]

Summary and Conclusions

In spite of the depth and breadth of the data and literature available for establishing an on-going program of Institutional Effectiveness that meets the SACS criteria, the job would appear to be overwhelming to a recent novitiate facing an impending reaccreditation review. Creating an Institutional Effectiveness program de nova is probably not really necessary. Almost all institutions in Florida and across the remainder of the U.S., already have major components of the Institutional Effectiveness program already in place. If an institution is already preparing graduate and transfer reports, placement reports, personnel reports, cost analyses, and internal or external surveys on specific components of the institutional mission then the key is to consolidate these data elements into comprehensive Institutional Effectiveness program and examine the results. It is quite possible that this framework for Institutional Effectiveness only needs "fleshing out" with some refinement and revision to existing evaluation programs and databases in order to coordinate an institution-wide Institutional Effectiveness program.

References Cited

Commission on Colleges, (1987), Resource Manual on Institutional Effectiveness. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Commission on Colleges, (1991), Criteria for Accreditation, Seventh Ed., Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

APPENDIX A

Specific SACS Criteria

Related to Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Effectiveness "Must" Statements from the 1991 Edition of the Criteria for Accreditation

Section I

The institution has a plan, as well as a planning and evaluation process, which addresses its educational, physical and financial growth.

Section II

The planning and evaluation processes must be designed to demonstrate that the institution's purpose and role are being fulfilled.

Section III

1. Institutions have an obligation to all constituents to evaluate effectiveness and use the results in a broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation process.

2. The institution must establish adequate procedures for planning and evaluation.

3. The institution must define its expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained.

4. Institutions with research or public service missions must develop and implement appropriate procedures for evaluating their effectiveness in these areas.

5. All institutions must engage in continuous study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs.

6. Institutions regularly must evaluate their institutional research function.

Section IV

1. All aspects of the educational program must be clearly related to the purpose of the institution.

2. The institution must demonstrate the comparable quality of its educational programs for all students.

3. The student enrollment and financial resources of the institution must be sufficient to support an effective educational program.

4. An institution must formulate clear and explicit goals for these activities [innovative delivery systems] and demonstrate that they are consistent with its stated purpose.

5. An institution must demonstrate how it will achieve these goals and how it will ensure overall effectiveness and quality consistent with the Criteria.

6. Each institution regularly must evaluate its admission policies. It is the responsibility of the institution to ascertain that its recruiting activities and materials accurately and honestly portray the institution.

7. Curricula must be directly related and appropriate to the purposes and goals of the institution, to the ability and preparation of the students admitted, and to the financial and instructional resources of the institution.

8. There must be a clearly defined process by which the curriculum is established, reviewed and evaluated. This process must recognize the various roles of the faculty, the administration, and the governing board.

9. Instructional techniques and policies must be in accord with the purposes of the institution, as well as appropriate to the specific goals of an individual course.

10. Instruction must be evaluated regularly and evidence collected to demonstrate that efforts are being made to improve instruction.

11. The effectiveness of instruction must be periodically studied.

12. All continuing education programs, both credit and non-credit, must be regularly evaluated.

13. A institution must provide a faculty of adequate size to support the institution's purpose and must have a procedure for equitable and reasonable assignment of faculty responsibilities - including classroom instruction, academic advising, committee membership, guidance of student organizations, and research and service to the public.

14. An institution must conduct periodic evaluations of the performance of individual faculty members.

15. The evaluation [of instruction] must include a statement of the criteria against which the performance of each faculty member will be measured.

16. The criteria [used for instructional evaluation] must be made known to all concerned.

17. The institution must demonstrate that it used the results of this evaluation for the improvement of the faculty and the educational program.

18. Contracts for educational services and programs must be consistent with the purpose, policies and procedures of the institution and must comply with the Criteria.

19. Any consortium or contractual relationship entered into by member institutions must be regularly evaluated.

Section V

1. Each institution must provide a variety of services that support its educational purposes.

2. Each institution must ensure that all students and faculty have access to the primary and secondary materials needed to support its purposes and programs.

3. The library must be evaluated regularly and systematically to ensure that it is meeting the needs of its users and supporting the programs and purpose of the institution.

4. The library collections and data bases must be sufficient to support the educational, research and public services programs of the institution.

5. The effectiveness of such cooperative arrangements [with other libraries and agencies] must be evaluated regularly.

6. At any off-campus location where credit courses are offered, an institution must ensure the provision of and access to adequate learning resources and services required to support the courses, programs, and degrees offered.

7. Policies for the allocation of computing resources and the assignment of priorities for computer use must be clearly stated and consistent with an institution's purpose and its goals.

8. To ensure effectiveness, goals for the student services program must be developed which are consistent with the student's needs and the purposes of the institution.

9. Student development services and programs must be regularly evaluated.

10. Human, physical, financial and equipment resources for student development services must be allocated on the basis of predetermined needs and must be adequate to support the goals of the institution.

11. An institution must provide an effective program of health services and education consistent with its purpose and reflecting the needs of its constituents.

12. The intercollegiate athletics program must be operated in strict adherence to a stated philosophy and purpose in harmony with and supportive of the institutional purpose.

Section VI

1. The effectiveness of administrators must be evaluated periodically.

2. The institutional administrative organization must reflect the purpose and philosophy of the institution and enable each functional unit to perform its particular responsibilities as defined by the stated purpose of the institution.

3. Each institution must possess sufficient financial resources to support all of its programs. The adequacy of the financial resources of an institution will be judged in relation to the basic purposes of the institution, the scope of its programs and the number of students.

4. An institution must prepare an appropriately detailed annual budget. Its preparation and execution must be preceded by sound educational planning.

5. Physical resources, including building and equipment used both on campus and off campus, must be adequate to serve the needs of the institution in relation to its stated purpose, its programs and activities.

6. The institution must maintain in writing a current facilities master plan that provides for the future orderly development of the institution. It should relate this plan to both the educational master plan the long-range financial plan.

7. Policies related to externally funded grants and contracts must ensure conformity of this activity to the stated purposes of the institution, provide an appropriate balance between this type of activity and instruction and guarantee institutional control of the administration of research projects.

APPENDIX B

ANNOTATED REFERENCES ON INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND OTHER SUGGESTED READINGS

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PUBLICATIONS

* * * \

ED297825 JC880375
"Institutional Effectiveness in the Community Colleges: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness through the Accreditation Process." Simmons, Howard L. Jul 1988. 19p.; Paper presented at the League for Innovation in the Community College Conference, "Institutional Effectiveness in the Community College" (Charlotte, NC, July 17-20, 1988).

Whether by state mandate, institutional initiative, or the requirements of accrediting bodies, community colleges and other institutions of higher education are giving increased attention to assessment and evaluation. In the region accredited by the Middle States Association (MSA) of Colleges and Schools, for example, several community colleges have implemented novel approaches to institutional evaluation. Genesee Community College (New York) and Middlesex County College (New Jersey) have adopted a cyclical program/service review process, using outside evaluators appointed by the MSA in consultation with the institution. Nassau Community College's (New York) review model focuses on the outcomes of the teaching/learning process, recognizing faculty as the key managers and practitioners of program review. Delaware County Community College (Pennsylvania) was one of the original participants in the American College Testing Program's College Outcomes Measures Project, and continues to use and improve this assessment model to evaluate student outcomes. Monroe Community College (New York) has developed a practical and readable fact book, which documents collegewide outcomes related to the fulfillment of specific goals and objectives. Dundalk Community College (Maryland) is currently undertaking a "Study of Learning Excellence" as a substitute for traditional accreditation self-study and evaluation processes. As a final example, New Jersey's community colleges use a state-mandated multidimensional program of outcomes assessment. Though community colleges are making progress in the assessment process, they must continue to develop their research capacity and adopt appropriate strategies for the assessment of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. (AJL)

Creating a Culture for Institutional Effectiveness, (April/May,1991), Richard L. Alfred and Paul Kreider, Community, Technical and Junior College Journal, pg. 34-39.

Effectiveness is situation- and context- sensitive. There is no definition or set of measures universally acceptable to all colleges. The purpose of this article is to provide a basic prescription for effectiveness in community colleges.

It is the authors intent to describe a culture for effectiveness that can be used as a frame of reference by leaders within their own colleges. The authors provide a comprehensive Institutional Effectiveness model which relates internal and external factors to student, institutional and area parameters. In addition the model includes a set of related "critical success factors" which are identified for each of the specific parameters.

Publications of Special Interest to Florida Community Colleges

ED318501 JC900216
Institutional Assessment Manual for the Review of Instructional Programs, Administrative Operations and Instructional Support Services. Florida Community Coll., Jacksonville. Nov 1989. 55p.

The institutional assessment model described in this report is used by Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FCCJ) to collect current information needed to update the goals of service and instructional units, identify opportunities for improved and growth, and assess the resources of the college. The first sections of the paper explain the role of institutional assessment in a cycle of planning, research, and marketing and establish its scope, purposes, and uses. The next section presents an overview of the three phases of FCJJ's assessment process: (1) an annual review of planning and marketing objectives, and of institutional and instructional program indicators; (2) scheduled in-depth reviews of all units by unit assessment communities, who prepare reports on strengths and weaknesses; and (3) reviews of such collegewide issues and concerns as funding, institutional and state policies, proposed legislation, and articulation agreements. The next sections discuss the assessment procedures and evaluation criteria specific to instructional support services and instructional units. Lists of FCJJ's assessment units and operational definitions of indicators conclude the paper. (WJT)

ED306980 JC890226
Institutional Effectiveness Indicators. Parker, Lynn S.; And Others. Florida Community Coll., Jacksonville. 27 Jan 1989. 48p.

Florida Community College at Jacksonville (FCCJ), this packet of materials identifies 31 indicators of institutional performance and assesses FCCJ in terms of those indicators

for which data were available. First, the packet presents a flow chart which illustrates the model used by FCCJ to measure institutional effectiveness, and a list comparing the issues considered most important by FCCJ's board of trustees, vice president, and selected faculty members. Next, a chart is presented showing the 31 performance indicators, their relation to institutional priorities, how they are measured, and their implications. Finally, each indicator is discussed individually, including background information and, where available, data on FCCJ's effectiveness. Graphs highlight students' College-level Academic Skills Test scores, job placement of vocational education graduates, transfer rate and transfer student success, passing grades of credit students, grade-level gains of adult basic education students, graduation rate among those pursuing an FCCJ high school diploma, racial parity among employees, average faculty entry salaries, on-campus enrollment, high school review enrollment, classroom utilization rate, total fundable full-time equivalent enrollment, current unrestricted balance fund, full- and part-time faculty, revenue sources, expenditures for instructional support and learning resources, percentage of black and white county residents enrolled in college credit and noncredit courses, student participation in college activities, and FCCJ attendance of local high school graduates. (AYC)

The Office of Institutional Planning and Instructional Support, Dr. Pamela D. Grey, Director. Institutional Effectiveness Indicators: 1990-1995. A Working Document of the Targets, Performance Standards and Issues for College Effectiveness Indicators. Prepared for: The District Board of Trustees, Florida Community College at Jacksonville, 1990.

ED319418 JC900247
The FACET Report. Toward 2001: An Odyssey of Excellence.
Saint Petersburg Junior Coll., Fla. Apr 1990.

In 1989, the Focus on Access, Community, and Excellence in Teaching (FACET) Commission was created at St. Petersburg Junior College (SPJC) to develop recommendations to guide the college into the 21st century. The commission's work plan included the definition of SPJC's educational standards; open hearing to solicit ideas from students, faculty, alumni, administration, staff, and community; and the exploration of ways to enrich teaching effectiveness. The investigation of the college's institutional values concluded that, above all, SPJC exists to serve students and to provide educational

opportunities for its multicultural community. Guiding principles developed for the college underscored the value of people, academic excellence, partnerships, innovation and creativity, and leadership. The Commission's findings with respect to employee selection, orientation, and evaluation; pay and professional recognition; faculty and staff development; and organization and program development resulted in a series of recommendations for improvement. Selected recommendations stressed that: (1) selection processes ensure that candidates understand and support SPJC's mission; (2) orientation procedures be expanded; (3) evaluation focus on both appraising and improving performance; (4) a faculty ranking system be established based on performance, longevity, credentials, and service; (5) outstanding achievement be recognized and rewarded; (6) a long-range plan for faculty and staff development be developed; and (7) SPJC continue to focus on student success and minority achievement, and implement new efforts in the areas of applied ethics and workforce literacy. A discussion of the characteristics of an excellent community college is attached. (WJT)

ED307914 JC890273
Increasing Institutional Effectiveness through Outcomes Assessment. Wilkinson, Donna; Green, Peggy. 1989. 39p; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (69th, Washington, DC, March 29-April 1, 1989).

In 1987, under pressure from its accreditation agency and the state, Broward Community College (BCC) initiated the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Project to improve the college through outcomes assessment. The project had four interrelated components: (1) a revision of BCC's mission statement to incorporate a new section on institutional values; (2) the Course Outline Review Project, which examined the purpose and expected educational results of individual courses; (3) the creation of 20 task forces to define expected outcomes for departmental units, such as the bookstore and library, and for associate degree and certificate programs; and (4) the formation of the Educational Planning Committee to recommend a college planning process and format for the resulting plan. After its second year to operation, the project had developed a revised institutional mission statement; had updated the content of 250 courses and revised course outlines to present objectives in the form of expected outcomes; had initiated a program of annual surveys of students, faculty, and

administrators to assess their perceptions of campus services; and was on its way to presenting the college president with a model and timetable for the development of an educational plan. Appendixes provide a copy of the revised BCC Mission Statement, forms used in the revision of course outlines, a list of task forces, recommendations of the associate in arts degree/honors task force, survey instruments, the timeline of the Educational Planning Committee, a report on a study of the effects of remedial reading instruction on subsequent college-level course work, and a sample project newsletter. (JMC)

In-House Manual, Institutional Self-Study, 1989-1990. Gulf Coast Community College.

Other Articles Available through ERIC on Institutional Effectiveness

EJ340216 HE521140
The Governor's Report on Education: Text of the Section on College Quality. Chronicle of Higher Education, v33 n1 p79-80,82-84 Sep 3, 1986.

The text is provided of the National Governors' Association report on the quality of undergraduate education, the state role, student assessment as a means of measuring educational quality, institutions that have implemented successful assessment programs, and the actions needed of governors, legislatures, coordinating and governing boards, and accrediting agencies. (MSE)

ED316277 JC900137
Results of the 1989 Self-Image Survey: Catonsville Community College. Turcott, Frances; Linksz, Donna Catonsville Community Coll., MD Office of Institutional Research. Feb. 1990.

Catonsville Community College (CCC) conducted a self-image survey to examine employees' perceptions about the college's instructional and student support programs and the general college environment. The survey was distributed to all full-time faculty, administrators, and classified personnel. It was also distributed to adjunct faculty during the fall 1989 organizational meeting. While a total of 218 persons responded, only 183 out of 640 full-time employees returned the survey; for a response rate of 29%. The survey asked respondents to rate the sensitivity and responsiveness of

CCC, the quality of programs and services, the performance of services, and the quality of promotional activities and materials. Survey highlights included the following: (1) the college was rated very highly in terms of friendliness of atmosphere, concern for students, and overall quality of education; (2) college transfer, career, and technical programs, developmental education, and continuing education and community services were all rated as above average; however, at least 20% of the respondents rated each of the programs as "don't know"; (3) faculty and staff perceived the availability of counselors and advisors to be somewhat of a problem; (4) respondents' ratings of student activities, admissions office programs, registration, childcare, health services, the college press, computer services, the business office, security, and libraries are given in the test and in an appended chart; (5) 85% rated the upkeep of the grounds as excellent; and (6) 81% would recommend that family or friends attend CCC. The survey instrument is appended, as well as charts and line graphs detailing responses. (WJT)

ED321698 HE023716
Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness: Career Student Outcomes. Conklin, Karen A. AIR 1990 Annual Forum Paper. May 1990.

Johnson County Community College, a suburban Kansas community college, conducted annual one-year and three-year follow-up studies of career program completers and their employers. The college used the follow-up studies as a component of an institutional effectiveness assessment program the purpose of which is to elicit evaluations of college programs and services, and to develop insights to career and educational experiences after students have left the college. The methodology consisted of a three-tiered approach incorporating contact with the graduated students through telephone interviews, follow-up surveys for nonrespondents, and an annual employer survey which attempted to determine employer evaluations of the preparation received by former career program students at the college. The results of the studies indicated that the majority of respondents had achieved their educational objectives, progressed in their careers, and improved in a variety of cognitive and noncognitive behaviors as a result of their college experiences. Such studies are not only important to assess the college programs' effectiveness, but they also enhance cooperation between the college and local business and industry, and provide salary and placement data that can be

utilized in recruitment efforts and career decision-making for future students. Contains seven references (GLR)

EJ407347 JC505303
Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness: A Practical Model for Small Colleges. Hockaday, Jeff; Friga, Jerome J. Community College Review, v17 n3 p28-33 Win. 1989
Reviews of the reasons for conducting institutional assessments regardless of college size. Identifies the elements of institutional effectiveness and translates them into six questions with quantifiable answers, which when tallied produce an overall assessment of program effectiveness. (DMM)

ED18511 JC900234
An Institutional Model for Assessment. Langley, Harry M.; Wood, Clara C. Mar 1990 90p.; Presentation presented at the Montclair Assessment Conference.

In March 1986, Brevard College, a private two-year liberal arts college, was evaluated for reaccreditation under the new criteria of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Recommendations resulting from the visit focused on long-range planning, identification of expected educational outcomes, and development of outcomes assessment strategies. In response, the college conducted a campus-wide workshop on educational outcomes, formulated a planning process, and tentatively reformulated the goals of the college. An Institutional Effectiveness Committee, consisting of faculty and administrators, was formed to recommend strategies and processes to the administrative staff for annual and long-range planning, as well as the means for evaluating the effectiveness of each action. The committee's directives for the 1987-88 academic year included: (1) discuss the function of planning and assessment with faculty, staff, and administrative units; (2) assist administrative units in following the approved planning process; (3) evaluate the effectiveness of the planning process; (4) assess the college's data collection activities; and (5) propose an overall method of outcomes assessment. Using Ken Yamada's variables for comprehensive institutional assessment, the committee developed an outcomes assessment model. The student assessment component of the model includes basic skills and diagnostic data, academic progress data for the first and second years, follow-up alumni surveys, transfer performance data, level of satisfaction determinations at

various points, and personal development. Other aspects of institutional effectiveness assessed in the model are faculty and administrator employment satisfaction, professional development, the quality of the faculty, system openness, community interaction, ability to acquire resources, and organizational health. Appendices include a list of the recommendations made to Brevard College and the college's responses, a synthesis of college goals, Brevard's model for faculty, staff, and institutional assessment, and year-end reports. (WJT)

ED317238 JC900188
Project Cooperation: A Survey on Using Student Outcomes Measures to Assess Institutional Effectiveness. Final Report: 1988 Survey of AACJC Institutions. Cowart, Susan Cooper. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC. National Council of Instructional Administrators.; American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, IA. Research Div.; National Council on Student Development. Washington, D. C. 1990.

In 1988, a survey was conducted of member institutions of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). The survey was designed to study and advance the use of student outcomes measures for assessing institutional effectiveness in two-year institutions. Three sets of student outcomes were identified for in-depth study: academic progress and employment outcomes, student learning outcomes, and student satisfaction outcomes. Responses were received from 675 institutions, representing approximately 54% of the total AACJC membership. Major findings of the survey were as follows: (1) 61% of the colleges used academic progress and employment outcomes measures to assess institutional effectiveness, and 66% of the colleges gave higher or far higher priority to these outcomes than to other types of student outcomes; (2) only 35% of the colleges measured student learning skills outcomes and used them for assessing institutional effectiveness; (3) skills assessment at entry was more common than exit-only assessment or entry-exit comparisons; (4) 55% of the institutions used student satisfaction to assess institutional effectiveness; (5) about 75% used measures of academic progress and employment outcomes in the accreditation process; (6) curriculum development was most often cited as the activity most affected by the use of outcomes measures; (7) respondents expected the priority associated with the use of student outcomes to increase within the next 3 to 5 years; and (8)

enrollment size, accreditation affiliation, and geographical setting were not significantly related to the use of outcomes measures. The survey instrument with percentage responses is included. (JMC)

ED316297 JC900167
Indicators for Institutional Effectiveness. 1990-1991. Research Report Number 63. Howard Community Coll., Columbia, MD. Office of Research and Planning. Mar 1990. 78p.

Data on ten aspects of the institutional effectiveness of Howard Community College (HCC) are presented in this report. Section 1 provides actual and projected enrollment figures. Section 2 assesses quality of instruction in terms of student survey responses, full-/part-time faculty ratios, and faculty salaries. Section 3 focuses on educational outcomes, including degrees and certificates awarded, goal achievement among students, employer satisfaction with graduates, and student satisfaction with preparation for transfer. Section 4 considers graduation and retention rates, course success rates, cooperative education placements, characteristics of continuing education students, and non-credit course enrollment patterns. Section 5 describes facilities' enhancements, including classroom utilization data on campus and at continuing education sites in Howard County. Section 6 provides graduates' ratings of college services. Section 7 looks at instructional programs planned for fall 1990 to fall 1994. Section 8 presents financial data, including information on budgets, revenue, and financial projections based on current trends. The image of the college in the community is the focus of section 9, which describes graduates' and community members' rating and use of the college. The final section presents affirmative action figures including headcounts by minority status and college personnel by racial/ethnic group. A list of recent HCC research publications concludes the document. (JMC)

ED311953 JC890455
Measuring Institutional Effectiveness. Macomb County Community Coll., Warren, Mich. 1989. 7p. Available From: Macomb Community College, 14500 Twelve Mile Road, Warren, MI

The measurement of institutional effectiveness involves a systematic comparison of organizational purpose and performance. For community colleges, organizational purpose can be defined in terms of providing access to education,

realizing student achievement, promoting student development, or addressing social needs. If all four purposes are acknowledge, then measures of effectiveness must be developed for each. At Macomb Community College (MCC), an effort was made to determine the institution's main purposes, select appropriate goals for each purpose, and identify the specific measures which accurately indicate institutional outcomes. The process included a survey of students to determine their definition of a successful college experience; the formation of four study teams to develop lists of outcomes measures for successful transfer, completion of personal goals, employability, community impact, satisfaction indices, and human development; and the selection of five or six goals for each institutional purpose. The resulting statement of MCC's purposes and goals included the following: (1) provide opportunity through equitable access; effective services; social, cultural, and cross-cultural opportunities; student/client goal clarification; and student/client retention; (2) realize student achievement, as measured by completion of the student's goals, academic success, successful transfer, and successful employment; (3) promote student development in terms of learning and human potential; and (4) address societal needs, such as promoting quality of life and well-being, institutional innovation in problem solving, development of the community, and designated for initial implementation already have data collection in progress. The next step is to establish a routine and a format for annual distribution of this information, and to increase awareness and understanding of the project. A chart illustrating institutional purposes and goals, and related measures, data sources, tracking frequency, and anticipated uses is attached. (JMC)

ED310818 JC890426
Institutional Effectiveness: A Three-Year (1985-1988) Status Report. Methodology, Findings, Next Steps. Institutional Research Report #43. Grosset, Jane; Hawk, Thomas R. Philadelphia Community Coll., PA. Office of Institutional Research. Sep 1988. 29p.; For a related report, see JC 890 427.

This paper presents a status report on efforts to assess institutional effectiveness at the Community College of Pennsylvania (CCP). Part I provides a description of the methodological and procedural considerations which have guided efforts to understand institutional effectiveness. First, a description is provided of the conceptual foundation

for assessment, which emphasizes examining educational effectiveness from both the student and college perspectives, understanding students' educational goals, and determining cognitive and non-cognitive outcomes for students. Next, eight positive effects of institutional research efforts are described, including the development and implementation of a set of all-college performance indicators, the design of new and continuing student goal statements, and the redesign of the program and discipline audit process. Part I concludes with challenges and future directions of CCP's assessment efforts. Part II highlights some of the major institutional strengths and concerns identified in the first 3 years of assessment, including: (1) students reported greatest progress in developing communication skills and self-confidence; (2) CCP students entered the job market with relative ease and at salaries reflective of the economic value added by the college; (3) completion of a degree did not always mean improved performance at a transfer institution, and transfer performance varied across programs; and (4) all students reported dissatisfaction with the opportunities for integration into the campus life. Finally, part III provides a framework for future efforts in examining student academic progress at CCP, focusing on Tinto's model of student attrition. This model maintains that students who are more involved in a college's academic and social life are more likely to persist and to have higher levels of personal/academic growth than less involved students. The report concludes with an application of Tinto's theoretical framework to CCP students and a future research agenda. A 17-item bibliography is included. (Author/JMC)

EJ380559 JC504918
Seizing the Agenda: Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes for Community Colleges. Kreider, Paul E.; Walleri, R. Dan. Community College Review, v16 n2 p44-50 Fall. 1988.

Acknowledges the need for state-level educational accountability, but argues that strategies for assessing educational outcomes should be an institutional prerogative and an integral part of the teaching/learning process. Criticizes assessment programs imposed by state governments, proposing instead a student-centered approach to the measurement of outcomes. (DMM)

ED303193 JC890044
Assessing the Institutional Effectiveness of Community and Technical Colleges. Grossman, Gary M.; Duncan, Mary Ellen. Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Dec 1988. 67p.

The model and instrument presented in this report were developed by the National Alliance of Community and Technical Colleges (NACTC) and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education for measuring a college's performance in terms of external demands and its own stated mission. Part I of the report describes the development of the model, including a review of the literature on the issue of institutional effectiveness, background information on the creation of a task force of the NACTC to address the issue, and the Alliance's model of institutional effectiveness. The model identifies six concerns faced by all colleges: (1) access and equity; (2) employment preparation and placement; (3) college/university transfer; (4) economic development; (5) college/community partnerships; and (6) cultural and cross-cultural development. Related to these six areas are 38 indicators of quality, which provide a foundation for the assessment of institutional effectiveness in terms of outcomes measures related to institutional mission. The second half of the report discusses the current activities of the institutional members of the NACTC in measuring institutional effectiveness in each of the six identified areas. The appendix contains an instrument based on the six areas of institutional concern and their respective indicators. (AAC)

ED305956 JC890176
Institutional Effectiveness Issues for Faculty. Buckheister, Amy. Rancho Santiago Community Coll., Santa Ana, Calif. Feb 1989 27p.

An overview is provided of the issues involved in the development of programs to assess institutional effectiveness, particularly as they related to California community colleges. After part I reviews the trends that have made institutional accountability a legislative concern nationwide, parts II and III consider various definitions of institutional effectiveness and ways of measuring it. Current practices and problems related to outcomes assessment, "value-added" measurement instruments, and exit testing are explored, the use of multiple measures and classroom-based research is suggested as a means of resolving

some of the shortcomings identified with other techniques. Part IV discusses the experiences of states that have implemented statewide assessment initiatives and offers case studies of Missouri's and Tennessee's approaches. Part V addresses faculty concerns about the effects of these programs on students, classroom methods, expectations, and their own role as faculty members. It also underscores the need for teacher involvement in the institutional effectiveness movement. Part VI examines California's position in relation to the movement, focusing on: (1) the provisions of Assembly Bill 1725 that require all community colleges to "phase in" assessment programs; (2) the role of accreditation in implementing the new programs; (3) the unique characteristics of California's community colleges and their students that make the models used in other states inappropriate; and (4) ways of identifying and developing criteria to measure the attainment of each institution's individual goals. (ALB)

ED321825 JC900423
Project Cooperation: Designing and Implementing Models of Outcomes Assessments for Two-Year Institutions. Report on Project Cooperation Summer Conference for Demonstration Sites (Nashville, Tennessee, July 9-11, 1989). Cowart, Susan Cooper. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC. National Council of Instructional Administrators.; American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, IA. Research Div.; National Council on Student Development, Washington, D.C. Jul 1989. 76p.

In July 1989, the members of Project Cooperation, 10 community colleges that had been invited to serve as demonstration sites for research on institutional effectiveness, were brought together for the second national colloquium on institutional effectiveness through outcomes measures. This report contains the presentations made at the colloquium and summaries of subsequent group discussions and break-out groups' reports. The first presentation was "Assessing Institutional Effectiveness," by John Harris, which focused on the evaluation of assessment instruments, selection vs. criterion testing, assessment in accreditation and self-study, assessment and the improvement of educational quality, quality improvement in a global context, the Deming Approach to quality control, inspection vs. process improvement, continuity, training, and leadership. The second presentation was "Outcomes Assessment in Action: The Northeast Missouri State University Experience," by Terry B.

Smith, which covered the creation of an assessment program; value-added assessment; stages of the assessment experience (i.e., readiness, implementation, acceptance, and commitment); and eight ingredients for success (i.e., large-scale student assessment, multiple measures, faculty ownership, student acceptance, assessment at all appropriate levels, usable and understandable data, flexibility, and the use of data to improve not punish). The final presentation was "Student Assessment Practices in the Community College: Current State, Desired State, Getting There From Here," by Kay McClenney. McClenney provided a brief overview of the current status of assessment in community colleges, propositions regarding desired future characteristics and directions for assessment programs, and key considerations in the development and implementation of assessment programs on local campuses. Lists of participants and their institutions, and of discussion group members are appended (JMC)

Additional Sources of Information Useful for Establishing Institutional Effectiveness Programs

Abram, R.; Ashley, W.; Faddis, C.; and Wiant, A. Preparing for High Technology Programs That Work. Research and Development Series No. 232. Columbus, Ohio: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1982.

Adelman, Clifford (Ed.). Performance and Judgment: Essays on Principles and Practice in the Assessment of College Student Learning. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Research. (Undated).

Alfred, R. L., The Paradox of Measuring Community College Success (Unpublished paper). Calafornia Colleges, Annual Research Conference, 1988.

Alfred, Richard L. and Vincent P. Linder. Rhetoric to Reality: Effectiveness in Community Colleges. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Community College Consortium, 1990.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Issues in Higher Education and Economic Development. Edited by Helen Roberts. Washington, D. C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1986.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. "Responding to the Challenge of a Changing American Economy: 1985 Progress Report on the Sears Partnership Development Fund." Washington D. C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1986.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Building Communities: A Vision For A New Century. A Report of the Communission on the Future of Community Colleges. Washington, D. C., 1988.

Banta, Trudi (Ed.) Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils. New Directions for Institutional Research (Report No. 59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Berdie, Doug R., et al. Questionnaires: Design and Use. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1986.

Bradburn, Norman M. Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Bray, Dorothy and Marcia J. Belcher (Eds.). Issues in Student Assessment. New Directions for Community Colleges (Report No. 59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1987.

Cameron, Kim. Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), 1978.

Cameron, K.S., "Effectiveness as Paradox: Concensus and Conflict in Conceptions of Organizational Effectiveness," Management Science, 32 (1986), 539-553.

Cameron, Kim. Critical Questions in Assessing Organizational Effectiveness. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), 1980.

Cameron, Kim. Domains of Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges and Universities. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), 1981

Chmura, Tom; Waldhorn, Steve; Gollub, Jim; Henton, Doug; Kelley, Robert; Lyman, Ted; Melville, John; and Scogin, Hal. The Higher Education-Economic Development Connection: Emerging Roles for Public Colleges and Universities in a Changing Economy. Public Policy Center, SRI International. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities under a cooperative agreement with the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1986.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B. The American College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cohen, Arthur M.; Lombardi, John; and Brawer, Florence B. Colleges Responses to Community Demands. Assisted by Joanne Frankel, Leslie Purdy, and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges Staff, University of California, Los Angeles. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cohen, Arthur M.; Palmer, James C.; and Zwemer, K. Diane. Key Resources on Community Colleges: A Guide to the Field and Its Literature. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Resource Manual on Institutional Effectiveness. Atlanta: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1987.

Delta College, University Center, Michigan. "The Impact of Community Colleges on Michigan and Its Economy." January 1984.

Diener, Thomas. ed. Growth of an American Invention: A Documentary History of the Junior and Community College Movement. Contributions To The Study Of Education, Number 16. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Dillman, Don A. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978.

Drueger, Richard A. Focus Groups: A practical Guide for Applied Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988.

El-Khawas, Elaine and others, Community College Fact Book (New York: Macmillan, forth-coming).

Ewell, Peter T. (Ed.). Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research (Report No. 47). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1985.

Ewell, Peter and Robert P. Lisensky. Assessing Institutional Effectiveness. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), 1988.

Goodwin, Gregory L. "A Social Panacea: A History of the Community-Junior College Ideology." In T. Diener (Ed.), Growth of an American Invention: A Documentary History of the Junior and Community College Movement. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Gray, Peter J. (Ed.) Achieving Assessment Goals Using Evaluation Techniques. New Directions for Higher Education (Report No. 67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1989.

Halpern, D.F. (Ed.) Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions for Higher Education (Report No. 59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982.

Harris, L., "2001: The World our Students Will Enter," Leadership Abstracts, League for Innovation in Community Colleges, (2) 5, March 1989.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Chapter Eleven: Establishing Alliances with Business and Industry." In Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era, pp. 222-231, edited by George B. Vaughan et al. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. All One System: Demographics of Education-Kindergarten Through Graduate School. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

Jacobi, Maryann, Alexander Astin, and Frank Ayala, Jr. College Student Outcomes Assessment. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education (Report No. 7). College Station, Texas: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1987.

Katsinas, Stephen G. and Lacey, Vincent A. Community Colleges and Economic Development: Models of Institutional Effectiveness. American Association of Ccommunity and Junior Colleges, 1989.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Korim, Andrew S. "Challenges Facing Community Colleges in the 1980s." In Occupational Education Today. New Directions For Community Colleges. No. 33, pp. 11-20. Sponsored by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Edited by Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Larkin, P. "Can Colleges and Universities Supply an Adequate Skilled Work-Force for Higher-Technology Needs in 1990? Problems, Prospects, and Policy for the Eighties." Research Report No. 82-27. Largo, Md.: Prince George's Community College, 1982.

McClenney, Kay, Nancy Armes LeCroy and R. Jan LeCroy. Building Communities through Strategic Planning. A Guidebook for Community Colleges. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1991.

Miller, Bob W. Higher Education and the Community College. 2nd Edition. New York: University Press Of America, 1984.

Mitzel, David P. ed. Resource Development in the Two-Year College. Washington, D. C.: National Council for Resource Development, 1988.

Naisbitt, John. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, 1982.

Olivas, M.A. The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two-Year Colleges. Washington, D. C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Orfield, G., et al., The Chicago Study of Access and Choice in Higher Education. Committee on Public Policy Studies Research Project, University of Chicago, 1984.

Parnell, Dale. The Neglected Majority. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, 1985.

Patton, Michael Quin. Qualitative Evaluation Methods: A Basic Guide. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

Patton, Micheal Q. Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978.

Peters, Thomas J.; and Waterman, Robert H., Jr. In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Project Cooperation: A Survey on Using Student Outcomes Measures to Assess Institutional Effectiveness. Final Report: 1988 Survey of AACJC Institutions. Cowart, Susan Cooper. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC. National Council of Instructional Administrators.; American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, IA. Research Div.; National Council on Student Development. Washington, D. C. 1990.

Quinn, R. E. and K. S. Cameron, Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management. Ballinger: New York, 1988.

References are drawn from "Community College Involvement in the Education of Adults." a survey submitted to The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching by Arthur Cohen, February 1987.

Rossman, Jack E. and Elaine El-Khawas. Thinking About Assessment: Perspectives for Presidents and Chief Executive Officers. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education and American Association for Higher Education, 1987.

Rutman, Leonard (Ed.). Evaluation Research Methods: A Basic Guide. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1977.

Slonim, J.M. Sampling in a Nutshell. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1960.

Stern, Joyce D., ed., The Condition of Education (Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1987), p. 26.

Templeton, Jane Farley. Focus Groups: A Guide for Marketing and Advertising Professionals. Chicago: Probus Publishing Company, 1987.

Terenzini, Patrick T. "Assessment with Open Eyes: Pitfalls in Studying Student Outcomes," Journal of Higher Education (November/December 1989).

Tyree, L. W., and McConnell, N.C. "Linking Community Colleges with Economic Development in Florida." ISHE Fellows Research Report No. 3. Tallahassee, Florida: Institute for Studies in Higher Education, 1982.

Weiss, Carol. Evaluation Research Methods: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Yarrington, Roger, ed. Educational Opportunity for All: An Agenda for National Action, pp. 141-151. In T. Diener (Ed.), Growth of an American Invention: A Documentary History of the Junior and Community College Movement. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Zeiss, P. Anthony. "Using Research To Stimulate Local Initiative For Economic Development." Community College Journal For Research and Planning, Spring/Summer 1987, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 49-55.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

SEP 20 1991